## REPORT ON SCHOOL ACCOUNTS

## Presented at Regular Meeting of the School Board Held Last Night.

ef schools. High school Hamilton Austin Counfellow Fannin Tarior Dow Hawthorne Cascara Elysian		attend- ance. 96.3 94.9 94.9 96.0 96.6 96.6 96.6 96.6 96.6	36 30 18 42 11 24 34
Total cor.or	ED SCHO		128
Hira echool	100	92.1	-
B s & runding Primary grades Fourth ward First ward First ward Fifth ward Langston Douglass	207 452 100 113 861 518	01.8 94.0 90.8 94.3 94.4 96.9 96.6	58 48 15 11 24 24 25
Total		94.5	186
Grand total Report of Lin	mer day.	04.5 Novemb	524 er 26.

courants were ordered issued in favor or its calainants.

Mr. How, the president of the board submitted to the members thereof a committed to the city by Highles, with regard to that Groupe to the city by Highles, with regard to the Groupe to the city by Highles, with regard to the Groupe to the city by Highles and the could not be considered to the city by Highles and the could not be considered to the city by Highles and the could not be covered to the city by Highles and the could not be covered to the city by Highles and the could not be tracked to the city by Highles and the could not be tracked to the city of House and naving leaves the could not be verified.

In you could be made and the city of House and having the deeds to recite that fact, the record hereafter will siways show the cruet facts of the transaction. If you have made an absolute sale of this property form the sale were used exclusively for school purposes for the colored population, and in think, it would be better if an exchange of the property could be made and the could be ma

sion during the examination, as well us to

speedily recover and be at his accustomed

The report of Haskins & Sells was as

Mr. Andrew Dow, President of the Board of Trustees of the Independent School District of the City of Houston, Houston,

committee of the board to dispose of the Gregorytown property and use the proceeds as a
payment on the property bought some time
ago in the Fourth ward and on which a
school house for colored youths has been
streeted. Mr. John H. Kirby some time ago
made an offer for this property, and Mr.
Pow was anthorized to open up tegoni
ations with Mr. Kirby for its sale upon
his return from New York.

HASKINS & SELLER REPORT.

The most important festure of the meeting was the receiving of the report of
Messra. Haskins & Sells, the expert accountants appointed by the city council
to undit the accounts of the school board.

The report is quite voluminous. The exsumination of the warrants, warrant stubs,
pay rolls, bills and other papers of the
school board lasted from April 14 to September S. the period embraced in the exsumination being from May 15, 1600, to the
date of the closing of the report. The report shows the amount of fraudulent warrants are still
outstanding and unpaid, masking the total
amount of these bogus warrants, paid and
outstanding mean the warrants are still
outstanding mean the warrants are still
outstanding mean the warrants are still
outstanding mean the sum of Silsil-221. The report of the experts also
shows that on September 8 the total indebtedness outstanding of the school board
was \$39,585,70. Since the date named \$12,
220,33 has been paid, leaving the total indebtedness outstanding of the school board
with the Sirus, at his office
in the city hall next Wednesday afternoon
at 2 o'clock, when the board would decide
what answer to give to the experts as to
what disposition was desired to be made
of the warrants and other papers of the
school board which came into their papers
of the server and former the president of
the hoard agreed to meet Mr. Brawn, who
a connected with the Sirus, at his office
in the city hall next Wednesday afternoon
at 2 o'clock, when the board would decide
what answer to give to the experts as to
what disposition was desired to be
made of the warrants an

complete in so far at the pay roll for salaries for the month of November, amounting to \$12,254.78 was

CURRENT LIABILATIES.

Exhibit H is a statement of the hand, the records would admit of its being made.

CURRENT LIABILATIES.

Exhibit "F." schedule 2. contains distribute of the hand, the records would admit of its being made.

The pay roll for salaries for the month of November, amounting to \$12,254.78 was

warrants as were presented for registration and may or may not represent all the warrants outstanding which were issued prior to the date mentioned. In he many instances as possible statements of account were secured from the creditors, but where these statements could not be obtained the Habilities abown represent the bills that were in the office of the former secretary remaining unpaid.

OVER PAYMENTS.

The total rental accrued from September II, 1900, to June 17, 1902, in favor of J. U. George, for the engine house on Hogan street, was \$348. The warrants issued to cover this rental aggregate \$368, an overpayment of \$20. This overpayment occurred in warrant No. 697, dated March 11, 1902, for \$50, whereas the amount should have been \$40, the period covered being only two months. The bill reads as follows: "Bent from January 17 to March 17, 1902, three months, at \$20, \$60," and was approved by the board wareh 4, 1902. This warrant, No. 697, is still outstanding and if presented for payment should be honored for but \$40.

Errors in the account of O. L. Cochran

Two distances as possible statements of account and that no such amount to the paid and outstanding, amount paid apparently fraudulent, with respect to both paid and outstanding, amount paid apparently fraudulent, \$100,208,361, amount paid apparently fraudulent, \$10,000,001, amount paid apparently fraudulent, \$10,000,001, amount outstanding apparently fraudulent, \$10,000,001, and warrant outstanding apparently frau

Lees:
Premiums on policies Nos.
2204. Aerna Insurance
company, and 6710, Hartford Fire Insurance company, included twice. 546 To
Premium on policy No.
7080. Hartford Fire Inplace at the school board meeting next

Among the former secretary's papers were found the following warrants which had been drawn but not issued:

pproved in the proved in the p

In favor of the Comment of the Comme

WARRANT STUBS.

be increased.

Blank warrants and stubs did not bear printed numbers, the practice apparently being to insert the numbers as the warrants were drawn.

Notice the apparent of the printer Neither the approved or unapproved bills nor the lists of bills approved by the board were filed in any regular order and the condition of the records kept by the formor secretary of the present board were other wise in poor condition. Yours very truly, Haskins & Sells,

Certified Public Accountants.

431 25 School board treasurer's receipts and disbursements from May 15, 1900, to September 8, 1902;

Total. \$183,024 T2 50,000 00 82,811 50 2,134 54 4,468 56 \$50,000 00 33,700 00 7 50 \$387,554 20 \$10,540 83 109,670 52 197,182 32 39,318 02 2,298 64 \$88,308 10 11,691 90 11,691 90 \$358,980 35 28,574 04 13,547 38 Difference, being warrants paid apparently fraudulent-exhibit "G"..... \$15,026 66 \$15,026 66 Exhibit "F," schedule 1, contains war-rants issued prior to May 15, 1800, paid subsequent thereto, the rotal being \$10. 540.85.

No bilis or approvals by
the board were found covering these warrants. S.
Grid'in could not be seen,
but the indorsements are apparently forgeries.
J. C. George, June 7, 1801, warrant No. 388

No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. J. C.
George advised the indorse-

\$2 00

the Individual, he located, he located, B. Brown company, August 13, 1971, warrant No. 425. No suss or approvals by the board were found covering this warrant. The O. B.

Brown company advised under date of October 28, 1902;
"We have no secount with the school board of your city at the present time, and have be recollections of doing any business with the board at any time in the post."

Bradner Smith & Co. June 7, 1901, warrant No. 238, \$194.75;
January 13, 1802, No. 618, \$356.90; January 13, 1902, No. 618, \$356.90; January 13, 1902, No. 619, \$356.90

No bills or approvals by the board were found covering these warrants. Bradner Smith & Co. advised under dates of October 1 and 27, 1892, that only two bills of goods had been nurchased from them; one for \$20.22 and the other for \$10.50. The indorsements on these warrants are apparently for gerles.

C. M. Barnes company, September 25, 1901, warrant No. 514, \$366.75

No bills or approvals by the board were found covering these warrants. Statement of account dated September 29, 1902, from C. M. Barnes company shows they have no record of these warrants, and the indorsements thereon was a forger.

J. W. Bray, January 23, 1901, warrant No. 346
No bills or approvals by the board were found covering this warrant, J. W. Fray advised verbally that the indorsement thereon was a forger.

Borden & Antill, May 2, 1904, warrant No. 346
No bills or approvals by the board were found covering this warrant. J. W. Fray advised verbally that the indorsement thereon was a forger.

Borden & Antill, May 2, 1904, warrant No. 346
No bills or approvals by the board were found covering this warrant. J. W. Fray advised verbally that the indorsement thereon was a forger.

Borden & Antill, May 2, 1904, warrant No. 346
No bills or approvals by the board were found covering this warrant. J. W. Fray advised verbally that the indorsement thereon was a forger.

Borden & Antill, May 2, 1904, warrant No. 346
No bills or approvals by the board were found covering this warrant. J. W. Fray advised verbally that the indorsement there on the board were found covering the board were found covering this warrant so and the board nothing direct but for other at all, as 1 and

nothing direct, but for other parties.

Crystal Ice & Fuel company, June 7, 1901, warrant No. 392, 803,75 Sentember 25, 1901, No. 548, 8187,50 October 28, 1901, No. 548, 8187,50 No. 583, \$197,50. No. 583, \$197,50. No. 581 Sentember 27, 1901, No. 583, \$197,50. No. 581 Sentember 27, 1901, No. 583, \$197,50. No. 581 Sentember 27, 1901, No. 583, \$197,50. Sentember 27, 1901, company have and from the independent and claim the independent and claim the independent and forgeries.

H. M. French, June 7, 1901, warrant No. 383

No. bills or approvals by the

J. H. Fletcher, September 24, 1940, warrent No. 66, \$103.16; February 13, 1962, No. 688, \$196.00; March 11, 1802, No. 886, \$119.75 No allis or approvals by the board were found covering these warrants, J. H. Fletch-er could not be seen, but the indorsements are

October 18. Heorre Gaertner, October 18, 1901, warrant No. 510, \$116.90; November 6, \$01, No. 648, \$203.20; January 9, 19-2, No. 608, \$253.20; January 9, 19-2, No. 608, \$253.00; February 12, 1902, No. 605, \$216.70; March 4, 1902, No. 580, \$122.65; March 4, 1902, No. 681, \$122.65; March 4, 1902, No. 681, \$122.65; March 4, 1902, No. 681, \$122.65.

No blis or approvals by the heard were found covering those warrants. Geo. Gaertner advised verbally that these amounts were never 1.278 05 264 00

ner advised verbally that three amounts were never due nor received by him, and that all of the indorsements were forgeties.

Griffin, January 23, 1901, warrant No. 281, \$175.50; December 4, 1901, No. 560, \$87.50.

No bills or approvals by the board were found covering three warrants. S. Griffin could not be seen, but the inforesements are apparently forgeties.

ment was a forgery.

Gien & Co. September 9, 1901,
warrant No. 5th.
No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. Ginn
& Co. advised under date
of November 6, 1902; "The
inclose d duplicate bill
(\$27.11) covers the only transaction with the Houston
board of education from
May, 1909, to date.

J. W. Hubert, August 13, 1901,
warrant No. 422, 503; October
2, 1901, warrant No. 504, \$35.
No bills or approvals by
the beard were found covering these warrants; neither were these amounts due
J. W. Hubert. The indorsements are apparently forgeries.

Hudson School Furuitus comonny, November 6, 1901, warrant No. 546, \$377,651 Decemher 9, 1901, warrant No. 576,
\$220.65; December 9, 1901,
warrant No. 576, \$220.65; Decentiser 9, 1901, warrant No.
677, \$220.65; December 9, 1901,
warrant No. 578, \$125.55...
No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering these warrants. The
Hudson School Furniture
company advised under
date of October 27, 1902;
"We have not sold the
school board of Houston any
furniture except what is included in our involve
amounting to \$1148.80. See
exhibit R schedule No. 2.
D. L. Jenkinson Supply company, January 20, 1802, warfant No. 625.
No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. Messrs.
Charlton, Dow and Barnett
dischim all knowledge of
the parties, nor could they
be located.

R. H. Locke & Co., August 31,
1901, warrant No. 433.
No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. Messrs.
Charlton, Dow and Barnett
dischim all knowledge of
the parties, nor could they
be located.

R. E. Lane, February 10, 1902,
warrant No. 648.
No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. The indorsenient is apparently a ored if presented for payment.

Gins & Co., January 23, 1901, warrant No. 231, unknown, \$27.11; July 16, 1802, warrant No. 857, E. F. Dupree, \$127.11 Ginn & Co. advised under date of November 6, 1902; "The inclosed duplicate bill \$27.11 covers our only transaction with the Housten board of education from May, 1903, to date Bill still unpaid." Then in a postscript; "No warrant has ever been lasued to us for same."

287.65

eting this warrant. The indorsement is apparently a
forgery.

John E Morin, January 25, 1901,
warrant No. 232.

No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. J. H.
Morin could not be seen,
but the indorsement is apparently a forgery.

C. H. Meyers & Co., September
24, 1900, warrant No. 94,
\$371.50; June 7, 1901, warrant
No. 358, \$330; June 7, 1901,
warrant No. 334, \$66; September 21, 1901, warrant No. 474,
\$353.71; September 23, 1901,
warrant No. 475, \$117; October
10, 1901, warrant No. 500,
\$159.60, November 14, 1901,
warrant No. 531, \$177.10; November 27, 1901, warrant No.
154, \$341.65; Junuary 20, 1902,
warrant No. 627, \$223.60; Junuary 20, 1902,
warrant No. 627, \$223.60; Junuary 20, 1902,
warrant No. 674, \$360.80.

No bills or approvals by
the board were found carering these warrants, and an
examinution of the books of
C. H. Myers & Co. falled to
disclose any record of sales
for these amounts. The 10dorsements on these warrants appear to be forgerles.
J. H. Mayer, February 13, 1902,

1.601 83

If Maker, February 18, 1902,
Warrant No. 666

No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. J. H.
Maker could not be seen,
but the indersement is apparatily a forgery.
Ruderslorf & Simpson, July 12,
1801, warrant No. 405

No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant. Mr.
Budersdorf advised verbally that the indersement was
a forgery.

| N List the indersement was a forgers. | | B Richardson & Co., September 24, 1900, warrant No. 110, \$482.10, April 17, 1901, war-rent No. 832, \$130, 45, June 7, 1801, warrant No. 886, \$316.75, No. 1018, or abprovals by the board were found covering these warrants. H. Richardson could not be located, and his partner, George Gaerther, could not puss on either the indorsements or the amounts, but they are apparently forgarles.

John Stadtler, January 25, 1902, warrant No. 629, £08.75; March 11, 1902, warrant No. 604, \$129.60; March 11, 1902, war-rant No. 665, \$139.60; March 11, 1902, warrant No. 698, No. 1904 No bills or approvals by the board were found cov-ering these warrants John Stadtler advised verbally that the indorsements were

that the indersements were forgeries.

J. Selby, November 6, 1901.
warrant No. 547

No bills or approvals by the board were found dovering this warrant. L. J. Selby was not seen, but his Houston representative propounced the indersement a forger.

nounced the indorsement a forger;
T. S. Verette, May 18, 1901, warrant No. 389

No bills or approvals by
the board were found covering this warrant; neither
was the amount due T. S.
Verette, The indorsement is
blainly a forger;
E. H. Williams, September 12,
1901, warrant No. 472, \$79.75,
November 18, 1901, warrant
No. 653, \$73.60,

No bills or approvals by
the board were found corcring these warrants. E. H.
Williams advised verbally
that the indorsements are
forgeries.
Warrants outstanding 133 35

Warrants outstanding which are appar-ntly fraudulent: ently frandulent:

-In favor of and Indorsed—
Bradner, Smith & Co., July 18, 1902, warrant No. 814, Bins & Settegast

No bills or approvals by the beard were found covering this warrant. Under dates of October 1 and 27, 1999. Bradner, Smith & Co. advised that only two bills of goods had been purchased from them; one for \$20,00 and the other for \$10,50. Both the indorsement and the signature of the president are apparently for well.

the signature of the president are apparently for geries.

W. W. Barnett, June 5, 1902, warrant No. Sol. unknown.

W. W. Barnett claims to have received a warrant about the above date, which he destroyed in the presence of Mr. Tracy for the reason that the above date, which he destroyed in the pay roll. It is possible that the warrant destroyed was not No. Sol. as no record on the stub-book can be found covering a former warrant returned to Mr. Tracy for the same reason, which warrant was in the possession of the accreary of the heard. Should this warrant. No. Sol. ever be presented for payment it should not be bonored, as the amennt is not due W. Barnett.

Collins Bres. July 50, 1822, warrant was in provided the same than the hill covering this warrant. No. Sol. Collins Bros. The hill covering this warrant was approved by the provise that the matter should be investigated and the bill approved by Dr. Parker did not

67 83

1,460

there was no warrants is-sued to my order at all, as I sold the board nothing di-rect myself, but for other parties. The indersements and signatures of the presi-dent on warrants Nos. Sta-and 858 are apparently for-geries.

J. V. Dealy company, July 12, 1901, warrant No. 405, un-The bill covering this warrant was approved August 7, 1961, and the amount in-cluded in warrant No. 419 for 852. The above amount is not due J. V. Dealy com-pany and should not be hou-ored if presented for pay-ment.

still unpaid." Then in a pestscript: "No warrant has ever been issued to us for same."

Bill for \$27.11 was approved by the board twice: on January 14, 1901, and again May 26, 1902. The figures on the approved list of the later date appear to have been raised \$100.

Hudson School Furniture company, November 6, 1901, warrant No. 524, E. F. Dupree, \$132.40, November 6, 1901, warrant No. 542, E. F. Dupree, \$533.80; April 3, 1902, warrant No. 730, E. F. Dupree, \$230.60.

The bills covering the above warrants were approved by the board November 5, 1904 (two), and March 4, 1902, respectively. The Hudson School Furniture company advised under date of October 22, 1902. "\* Will bey that warrants returned to Mr. Tracy were not in dorsed by us. They were returned just as they were returned just as they were returned just as they were received and he was notified that we would not accept warrants due November 1, 1902, in payment for a cash account. " \* But if the warrants are indorsed it is an absolute forgery, because we refused the warrants and indorsed the warrants and did not accept them in settlement, therefore did not indorse them, and it don't matter if there is an indorsement of the Hudson School Furniture company is concerned."

S. Lane, April 3, 1902, warrant No. 750. E. F. Dupree.

dersement of the Hudson School Furniture company is concerned."

R. S. Lane, April 2, 1902, warrant No. 756 E. F. Dupree... No bills or approvals by the board were found overling this warrant. R. S. Lane advised verbally that indersement was a forgery.

C. H. Meyers & Co., August 14, 1902, warrant No. 571, E. F. Bupree, \$257.50; August 14, 1902, warrant No. 573, E. F. Dupree, \$257.50; August 14, 1902, warrant No. 573, E. F. Dupree, \$257.50.

No bills or approvals by the board were found overling these warrants apparently bear forged signatures of the president, and E. F. Dupree advised that C. H. Meyers pronounced the indersements forgeries.

Geo. J. Mellinger, November 6, 1901, warrant No. 520, not dispessed of The bill covering this warrant was approved by the board November 5, 1841, George

and that the indorsement thereon is a forcer;

H. Hichardson & Co. June 25, 1990, warrant No. 44, unknown No bills or approvate by the Soard were found covering this warrant. H. Etchardson could not be located, but the amount is apparent by not due the firm, and if the warrant is ever presented for payment it should not be honored without a thorough investigation.

J. Tiffany, March 21, 1902, warrant No. 717, Bins & Settegast, 8375; March 21, 1902, warrant No. 717, South Texas National bank, 8375; May 9, 1002, warrant No. 717, South Texas National bank, 8375; May 9, 1002, warrant No. 717, South Texas National bank, 8375; May 9, 1002, warrant No. 717, Both disposed of, 8375. The bill for which these warrants were issued to cover was for \$376 and was approved by the hoard twice; on March 4, 1902, in the name of A. J. Tiffany, and on May 29, 1802, in the name of J. C. Downes (manager for Texas and New York for A. J. Tiffany; The above warrants were all issued to the order of J. C. Downes.

Under onte of April 23, 1902, J. C. Downes requested Mr. Tracy, by letter, to sell his warrant and rendt him the proceeds, after deducting his (Tracy) charge. The date of this letter has been changed to July 23, 1902, and the secretary of the board, were sold to the present holders on the strength of this letter. On July 28, 1802, Mr. Tracy.

Bills for which warrants have not be located.

ted. It is always bad, though some no external symptoms of the dis-Because the disease is slow in oping does not indicate that they a mild one, for the poisonous work in the blood and system spending its force upon some spending its force upon some invital organ while you are lookingle ternal signs. Contagious Boot for does not affect all alike. In most the first little sore is quickly followed painful swellings in the groun is eruption upon the body, sore or in the mouth and throat, unsightly colored biotches, loss of hair said brows and other symptoms of this colored biotenes, loss of hair est brows and other symptoms of this able disease. When the poison as fighting its way to the surface, true the disease in all its hideouspes, it a bad case; but Contagions loss in a bad case; but Contagions loss in the contagions of son, whether working internally or son, whether working internally emnally, is a dangerous, treachers in
S. S. S. is the only remedy that
Contagious Blood Poison through a
permanently. It is an antidot for
deadly virus that produces the secruptions, sores and ulcers, and disthe bones. Mercury and Potah or
the skin eruptions, but in so dars
the poison further into the series

the poison further into the system it slumbers for a time, but consider again with redoubled fury. S. S. S. is a vegetable remedy if been used successfully for years in ing this vilediese cures it in all our forms. If you has align test symptocasional sorter

pains, your blood is tainted and the is liable to break out again at type A course of S. S. S. will remove trace of poison and at the suns build up your general health.

Write for our Free Home 7:00 book. No charge for medical advis-The Swift Specific Co., Atlanta &

wrote Mr. Downes as follows: "I inclose herewith warrant No. 838 for \$575 to cover your bill for III fany industrial cabinets." I have endeavored to find a purchaser for ints warrant, but there seems to be no market for it at present.

Mr. Downes advised, under date of October S, 1502: "I never indorsed nay warrant for \$375 covering the amount of this bill. Mr. Tracy never sold any warrant for me with my knowledge, nor have I received any proceeds whatever from Mr. Tracy or any one else covering, the amount of this account have instructed Mr. Tracy to indorse my name or anything, as I do my own indorsing. If Mr. Tracy has discounted a warrant in my favor purporting to hear my indorsement. It is without my knowledge or consent.

The warrant No. 538, for 8375, was issued to the order of A. J. Tiffany, and on October 20, 1902, was still in his hands.

Total 1998

Finite H Warrants ourstanding issued prior in 15, 1900, and apparently genuine:

In favor of J. B. Bell. November 14, 1809, warrant No. 362

J. B. Bell. November 14, 1809, warrant No. 553

L. E. Davis, February 8, 1800, warrant No. 550

L. E. Davis, February 8, 1800, warrant No. 551

Edith Munger, February 9, 1800, warrant No. 551

H. Waddell, November 14, 1809, warrant No. 550

L. V. Watson, February 3, 1800, warrant No. 550

L. V. Watson, February 3, 1800, warrant No. 507

L. V. Watson, February 3, 1800, warrant No. 508

Issued subsequent to May 18, 1809, and apparently genuine Exhibit "G"

per annum: interest payace semi-annually Unclaimed wages:
Getrude Blenkney, pay rool dated May 31, 1901
W. B. Coyle, pay roll dated May 1, 1900
W. B. Coyle, pay roll dated April 6, 1900
W. B. Coyle, pay roll dated June 1, 1980
Grace Darillog, pay roll dated 1,500.00

W. B. Coyle, pay roll dated
June 1, 1989,
Grace Darling, pay roll dated
November 8, 1991,
W. M. C. Dickson, pay roll dated
June 1, 1990
Mrs M. Kleiber, pay roll dated
June 1, 1990
Rebecca Pryor, pay roll dated
May 14, 1990
Rebecca Pryor, pay roll dated
June 1, 1999
James Starks, pay roll dated detober 12, 1990
Majnie Williams, pay roll dated
Majnie Williams, pay roll dated Marile Williams, pay rell dated May 13, 1901

Grand total schedule No. Led Exhibit "II" schedule No. Led secounts payable Scutember to lar which warrants do not appear to lar drawn, being a total of appeared 204-30; not approved. 87,000.81. Exhibit "J.

Bills for which warrants have been issued and for which bills approved to

Date-Name-	On paid warrants.	standing warrants
September 9, 1901 Bering Manufacturing		\$56 14
October 2, 1901—Torrey & Co.  uguis 14, 1902—Terrey & Co.	\$125 00	******
August 14, 1902-Terrey & Co	47 00	40000
September 9, 1901—C. L. & Theo. Bering 'ebruary 7, 1902—C. L. & Theo. Bering 'esptember 9, 1901—J. J. Pawtorlas P. & L. Co	243 95.	Axeren.
Chrunry 7, 1902-C. L. & Theo Baring	40.10	141 10
eptember 9, 1901-1 I Pastarian P 4 t.	TAXABLE NO.	141.59
september 9, 1901—F. E. Adams—Pythian hall, uly 3, 1900—F. E. Adams—Pythian hall, eptember 9, 1901—Houston Daily Herald.	50.00	NAMES TO
013 5, 1900-F. E. Adams	12 50	
eptember 9, 1901 - Houston Daily Herald	74 60	443495
September 37, 1900 M. D. Bennett	103 90	******
October 2, 1901—A. Lipper & Co.	277 00	*****
August 14, 1902-A. L. Steele & Co.	00.00	V21.557
anuary 16, 1872 - Houston Pileg, and Mrg. Co	100 50	
anuary 10, 1902 Berston Pibs and Mrs. Co	100.00	49495
September 12, 1500 H. Blehardson & Co.	91.25	9.14.578
august 0, 1902 — Weens & Bering October 2, 1907 — J. C. George Pecember 14, 1900 — T. S. Vereite Detober 16, 1900 — Abbett Cockeal	28 00	*****
Setober 2, 1901-J. C. George	44.00	411315
December 13, 1900-T. S. Vereite	305:00	41144
Detober 16, 1900—Abhett Cockrell		44440
September 12: 1900 J. H. Fletcher	160 00	400.000
anuary 4, 1602 Crystal Ice and Fuel Co.	41 00	130.00
september 9, 1901 Crystal Ice and Fuel Co.	165 00	165 56
september 9, 1801 C. H. Moyers & Co		110
September 9, 1801—Ed Banks.	31 50	31117
October 2 1901-Ed Banks.	75 60 7 50	******
uly 5, 1900 Deutsche Zeitung and Angleger.	7 50	8.00
September 9, 1901 Housing and Annieger.	Assessment of the	- 04
December 9, 1001—Central Wood and Coal Co	5767 505	
anuary 4, 1992 Central Wood and Coal Co	84 00	67.83
uly 30, 1902 Collins Bros.	4444955	
September D. 1901 Gustave Wilkening	85	201444
December 9, 1901 - Gustave Wilkening	40	444944
November 16, 1900—Sam Stewart January 28, 1901—White Plans	5.00	7,0000
ambanchas a toos of the same showing and offices to	5.00	22 30
January 22, 1901—White Line Moving and Storage Co September 9, 1901—C. M. Barnes Company. December 24, 1900—W. W. Barnest August 13, 1900—W. W. Barnest	GIVE SA	1.444
Angust 13 2000 av vo Barnett	5 00	100
Tune 15, 1901 W W Barnett	856 65	- Second
luly 3, 1901 W W Darnett	208 83 208 83	
December 24, 1800	208 33	A SAME
Detaber 1. 1901-W to Barnett	208 55	
Sorember 1, 1901 W or Barnett	208 83	-28917
anuary 2, 1902-W W Barnett	208 33	11000
Sphember of sold the Contract	2132 - 652	- 7111000